



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-49983 of 2025(O&M)

Date of Order:08.09.2025

Aakash**..Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****..Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL****Present: Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner.****Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana****Mr. Mayank Goyal, Advocate, for the complainant.****SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE**

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.278, dated 11.08.2025, under Sections 80(2) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, Police Station Sector 65, Gurugram, District Gurugram, Haryana. This is his first application for anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner and the deceased were married on 06.12.2020 and minor girl child was born to them on 26.12.2023. He further submits that before registration of the FIR, no prior complaint was ever moved to the police regarding any torture or demand of dowry. It was argued that real sister of the deceased was married with the real brother of the petitioner on the same very day and the elder sister never ever complained of any demand of dowry. Rather she had sworn an affidavit Annexure P-4 that relations of the petitioner and family members of the deceased were cordial and that deceased was never harassed for dowry or nor any car was demanded. It was further argued that the post-mortem report of deceased did not mention any external or internal injury



except a ligature mark and the deceased also did not leave any suicide note.

Learned counsel further argued that petitioner was ready and willing to join investigation and he be accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail.

On advance notice, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, appears on behalf of the State and submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner-husband of the deceased was necessary for recovery of mobile phone.

Mr. Mayank Goyal, learned counsel for the complainant has appeared on his own and placed on file his Power of Attorney. Same is taken on record. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that antecedents of the petitioner were not clean. He was involved in a case under Section 25 of the Arms Act, Police Station Phase-I, D.L.F., Gurugram and another case under Section 306 IPC, though in that case he had been acquitted.

Allegations against the petitioner are of causing the dowry death of his wife within seven years of marriage. His custodial interrogation is required by the police for effecting recoveries and eliciting useful information. The allegations are serious, specific and considering the gravity of the offence, petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

08th September, 2025

nt

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No